

Appin No. 09/575,193
Amdt. Dated November 4, 2003
Reply to Office action of August 5, 2003

4

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. The Applicant has carefully considered the official communication dated August 5, 2003. Applicant respectfully submits that the following remarks are fully responsive to the official communication.
2. In paragraph 2 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts. In particular, the Examiner has stated that Roberts shows: "..., the module being responsive to the user requesting first information from the source for generating a first printed medium that displays to the user the first information together with second information derived from a second party;"
3. Applicant submits that this is incorrect. Roberts does not disclose a module that is responsive to a user requesting first information. Rather, it would appear that the "first information" of Roberts is pre-printed on the lottery ticket and the "module" of Roberts prints "second" information on that lottery ticket to generate a completed lottery ticket (See column 2 in general of Roberts). Furthermore, it is clear from a reading of Roberts that there is only the "source", where data relating to the lottery ticket being sold is collated and not a "second party".
4. The Examiner has further stated that Roberts describes: "identifier means for applying an identifier to the first printed medium such that designation of the identifier by the user results in the module generating a second printed medium that displays to the user third information;..."
5. The Examiner has proceeded further and stated that Roberts lacks explicit recitation of the identifier means etc., and has stated that Roberts reasonably suggests same. The Examiner has based this conclusion on the allegation that the whole document suggests the desirability of that integer.
6. Applicant respectfully submits that this is incorrect. It should be noted that in the system of the claimed invention, the user obtains two print mediums. The Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion in Roberts that the provision of a second print medium containing third information is desirable. This would intimate that it would be desirable that a user would purchase an uncompleted lottery ticket, pay for that lottery ticket, which would then be completed and then receive a second item of printed material. It is respectfully submitted that Applicant cannot see how this would lead to an improved lottery ticket terminal.
7. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no provision for a calculation means in Roberts that determines a payment to be made. Rather, Roberts discloses a vending machine for vending lottery tickets at a predetermined price. The vending machine is able to calculate whether or not the correct price has been paid, not the amount payable.
8. In view of the above paragraphs, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has based the grounds for rejection on incorrect premises. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 has been traversed.
9. Claims 2 to 25 are all dependent on claim 1 and it follows that the above paragraphs are apposite.

Appin No. 09/575,193
Amdt. Dated November 4, 2003
Reply to Office action of August 5, 2003

5

10. The Examiner has rejected independent claim 26 for substantially the same reasons. It follows that the rejection of claim 26 has also been traversed.

11. Claims 27 to 30 are all dependent on claim 26 and it follows that the above paragraphs are apposite.

12. The Examiner has rejected independent claim 31 for the same reasons as claim 1. It follows that the rejection of claim 31 has been traversed.

13. Claims 32 to 55 are all dependent on claim 31 and it follows that the above paragraphs are apposite.

14. The Examiner has rejected independent claim 56 for the same reasons as independent claim 26. It follows that the rejection of claim 56 has been traversed.

15. Claims 57 to 60 are all dependent on claim 56 and it follows that the above paragraphs are apposite.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762